



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/623,970	12/28/2000	Isao Karube	201487/1030	1866

7590

12/04/2002

Michael L Goldman  
Nixon Peabody  
Clinton Square  
PO Box 31051  
Rochester, NY 14603

EXAMINER

LOEB, BRONWEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1636

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/623,970

Applicant(s)

KARUBE ET AL.

Examiner

Bronwen M. Loeb

Art Unit

1636

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 13 November 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.


The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: 6 and 21.Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 22-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

  
REMY YUCEL, PH.D  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 1, 6 and 21-24 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan (GB 2 209 468 A) and the rejection of claim 21 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, written description.

Continuation of 10. Other: The rejection of claims 1 and 22-24 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, lack of written description is not overcome by Applicant's amendment or arguments. Applicant refers to the Ishii declaration submitted 14 February 2002 (Paper No. 11) and argues that using the techniques discussed in the declaration and routine experimentation, one of ordinary skill in the art would be readily able to select useful combinations of membrane-disrupting reagents and stimuli. This argument, while germane to an enablement rejection, is not germane to a written description rejection. As previously discussed, the claims encompass a very large number of species and the specification discloses only one species. There is no teaching of a common structure-function element(s) for the one disclosed species and all the other encompassed species, thus the single species is not representative number for the number of species encompassed by the genus. Applicant's argument is, however, persuasive with respect to claim 21 which has been withdrawn from this rejection.